IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 1237 of 1995

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble CHIEF JUSTICE MR DM DHARMADHIKARI
and
Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE C.K.THAKKAR

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgement? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

RAVINDRA M PATEL

Versus

CHABILDAS MEHTA

Appearance:
MR DR BHATT for Petitioner
MR JIVANLAL G SHAH for Respondent No. 1
Mr.Kamal Trivedi, of M/S TRIVEDI & GUPTA,
for Respondent Nos.5, 6 and 9.
Mr.P.G. Desai, Government Pleader, for respondent No.4.
NANAVATI ASSOCIATES for Respondent No. 9

CORAM : CHIEF JUSTICE MR DM DHARMADHIKARI and
MR.JUSTICE C.K.THAKKAR
Date of decision: 16/02/2000

C.A.V. JUDGEMENT: (Per D.M. Dharmadhikari, C.J.)

1. This is a public interest litigation by an individual, who has disclosed his status as Consultant Engineer, and Supervision Agent. The reliefs, inter alia, claimed are to hold enquiry into the alleged illegal or unlawful activities of the Gujarat Energy Development Agency. Directions are also sought to set aside allotment of lands to the favoured parties. The other reliefs claimed are that purchase completion certificate issued be suspended. Respondent No.7 K.M. Dholakia be not appointed on any post in GEDA.

2. This Public Interest Petition was filed in the year 1995. Today, on the date of hearing, neither the petitioner nor his counsel appeared to press the petition. Since this is a public interest litigation, we perused the relevant contents of the petition and the reply. We also heard learned counsel appearing for GEDA, respondent No.6, and the Government Pleader, appearing for the Government of Gujarat. It has been pointed out to us that the petitioner has filed this petition with an ulterior personal motive. It has not been filed for any public cause. The petitioner himself is a Consultant Engineer of two Companies and is a disgruntled person. Several causes of action and reliefs have been combined. Certain contracts awarded by GEDA, for which the petitioner had objections on behalf of unknown parties, whom he represents, have already been completed.

3. We find no foundation in the petition to direct any kind of enquiry or action against GEDA and its authorities. The petition is, therefore, dismissed, and Rule is discharged, but, in the circumstances, without any order as to costs.

****

(apj)